

## REMARKS

Applicants note that all amendments, cancellations, and additions of Claims presented herein are made without acquiescing to any of the Examiner's arguments or rejections, and solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals (PBG),<sup>1</sup> and without waiving the right to prosecute the cancelled claims (or similar claims) in the future.

The present office action included a request for drawing corrections. The Applicants have provided replacement drawings attached to this communication. The Examiner has objected to Claims 38, 51, 67 and 73 as "being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim." Office Action, pg. 2. Applicants note that Claim 79, rather than 73 (which is an independent claim), should properly be placed in the above listing of objected claims. The Applicants have canceled Claims 38, 51, 67 and 79. As such, the objection is moot.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 47, 48, 90, and 91 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise being allowable (Office Action, pg. 7). As described below, the Applicants have incorporated the elements of Claims 47 and 90 into independent Claims 33 and 72. Claims 48 and 91 have been amended to be dependent on Claims 33 and 72, respectively.

In the office action dated 6/29/03, the Examiner made two rejections. The rejections are listed below in the order in which they are herein addressed.

(1) Claims 33, 35, 38, 45, 46, 49, 51, 54, 59-67, 69, 72-77, 79-81, and 88-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as allegedly being obvious in light of Jindal et al. (U.S. Patent 6,358,692; hereinafter Jindal) in view of Naveh et al. (U.S. Patent 5,451,662; hereinafter Naveh); and

(2) Claims 33, 35, 38, 39, 45, 46, 49, 51, 53, 54, 59-67, 69, 70, 72-77, 79-82, and 88-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as allegedly being obvious in light of Jindal et al. (U.S. Patent 6,358,692; hereinafter Jindal) in view of Naveh et al. (U.S. Patent 5,451,662; hereinafter

---

<sup>1</sup> 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (Sept., 8, 2000).

Naveh) and further in view of Verentchikov et al (U.S. Patent 6,534,764; hereinafter Verentchikov).

### **The Claims are Non-Obvious**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 33, 35, 38, 45, 46, 49, 51, 54, 59-67, 69, 72-77, 79-81, and 88-89 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as allegedly being obvious in light of Jindal in view of Naveh and Claims 33, 35, 38, 39, 45, 46, 49, 51, 53, 54, 59-67, 69, 70, 72-77, 79-82, and 88-89 as allegedly being obvious in light of Jindal et al. in view of Naveh et al. and further in view of Verentchikov et al (Office Action, pg. 3 and 5).

The Applicants respectfully disagree. Nonetheless, in order to further the business interests of the Applicants and while reserving the right to prosecute the original (or similar) claims in the future, the Applicants have amended independent Claims 33 and 73. The amended claims incorporate the elements of 47 and 90, which the Examiner has indicated are allowable (Office Action, pg. 7). As such, the Applicants respectfully request that the claims be passed to allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

If a telephone interview would aid in the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned collect at (618) 218-6900.

Dated: September 29, 2004

By:



Tanya A. Arenson  
Registration No. 47,391

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP  
101 Howard Street, Suite 350  
San Francisco, California 94105  
608/218-6900

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Please replace Figures 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 18 with the substitute drawings attached hereto.